

The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 22, 1904. No. 36.

THE HUMANIZING OF THE BRUTE.

IT is a well-known fact that in the homes of the "upper ten thousand" special servants, not infrequently placed in charge of animal pets, play an important part. It is the interesting duty of these happy mortals to rouse the lovely poodles, pugs, and pussies from their pleasant slumbers, to attend to their toilet and attire, on bright and sunny days to take them out for a drive or lead them a-promenading down a cool and shady avenue, and, last not least, to dance humble attendance upon their charges when feasting at a lordly and luxurious table. More than this, houses of refuge and asylums for orphaned cats have been erected at Berlin, and from Paris it was reported that together with the last exposition the first cemetery for dogs, cats, birds, and other domestic animals was opened. This city of the dead, with its resplendent monuments indicating the last resting-place of the nobly deceased, is said to rival a fairy-palace in beauty. Indeed, as J. G. Holland expresses his sentiments in very pathetic terms to his "dear dog Blanco":

"I look into your great, brown eyes,
Where love and loyal homage shine,
And wonder where the difference lies
Between your soul and mine
I clasp your head upon my breast—
The while you whine and lick my hand—
And thus our friendship is confessed
And thus we understand.
Ah, Blanco! Did I worship God
As truly as you worship me,
Or follow where my Master trod
With your humility:
Did I sit fondly at his feet
As you dear Blanco sit at mine,
And watch him with a love as sweet,
My life would grow divine."

These few but telling facts furnish a striking illustration of the senseless mania prevalent in our days of regarding the animal as a brother of man, his equal in nature and essence. Indeed, since the days of Brehm and Darwin, nearly all books treating of animals avail themselves of every occasion to dilate as much as possible upon the "intelligence" of brutes. There are comparatively few naturalists of any reputation who do not admit animal intelligence as a foregone conclusion, since it is supposed to be so evidently manifest from the actions of animals that no one can seriously controvert it. Not to speak of higher animals, suffice it to say that even ants have been found to betray a "high degree of intelligence," a "remarkable power of observation," and "the faculty of making conscious provision for the future." Yea, "it may be asserted without hesitation that animals often think and act more human-like than men themselves" (sic!).

We can not on the other hand deny that a kind of reaction is taking place in certain scientific circles even among the followers of Darwin. Men like Emery, Forel, Morgan, Peckham, Wheeler, Wundt, complain of an uncritical spirit being so dominant in "popular psychology" that, in consequence of it, whole series of animal actions are indiscriminately explained as manifestations of intellect. But even the above mentioned scientists are agreed that at least "quelque lueur d'intellect," a transient spark of reflecting reason, can easily be traced in the actions of even lower animals. Packard declares in the name of all: "Those naturalists who observe most closely and patiently the habits of animals do not hesitate to state their belief that animals, and some more than others, possess reasoning powers, which differ in degree rather than in kind from the purely intellectual acts of man."*)

Now upon investigation into the cause underlying this erroneous principle we might, as far as the more popular circles are concerned, discover one reason in the nervous sentimentalism of our days. At the beginning of the twentieth century, no less than towards the end of the eighteenth, people have become extremely sensitive to any sort of pain. Pain like a haunting spectre is dreaded with the utmost anxiety and avoided even to a nicety; and since the human heart is inclined to find some correspondence between external circumstances and its own apprehensions and emotions, it kindles in sympathy wherever pain is noticed, whether real or imaginary. And this inclination will grow stronger as soon as there is question of animated beings that are attached to man and afford him sensuous pleasure, and that at the same time leave upon him the impression of a certain helplessness. Of

*) A. S. Packard, M. D., Ph. D. Zoology (10th edition), p. 680.

course, as is attested by daily experience, one of the first and foremost places among such cherished creatures must be assigned to the animals known as our "domestic companions." Besides there exists a certain analogy between the manifestations of pain in man and in the brute, between the expression of man's spiritual affections and the corresponding merely sensuous feelings indicated in the features of animals. And thus it happens that from the expression visible in the eye of a faithful dog the inference is drawn, not to an empty stomach, but rather to a heart oppressed by sorrow and even weariness of life. In other words, it is from sheer sentimentality that the spiritual affections proper to man alone, are under similar circumstances attributed to animals; hence it follows that a genuine consciousness of pain, presupposing reason and intellect, is ascribed to them.

A second reason for this universal anthropomorphism is slightly touched upon by Peckham when he speaks "of the futility of any attempt to understand the meaning of the actions of animals until one has become well acquainted with their life habits."[†]) In fact, many animal actions, judging from appearances, bear such traces of intelligence that they are almost involuntarily attributed to an intellectual principle. A more careful examination, however, and comparison with other actions of the same animal, will soon convince us of our error. But sad to say, just this has been neglected by so many writers on the subject. And as it is to be expected from their imperfect knowledge of animal habits, we find such savants indulging in statements and expressions such as those which we have cited in the beginning of this paper.

The defective philosophical training and superficial education so prevalent in our times, suggest a third reason for this mania of ascribing intelligence to animals. For ever since the destructive attempts, by Kant and his disciples, to shake and shatter the realms of ideas, the true object of philosophy is ignored and lost. The noble queen, the exalted offspring of eternal wisdom, has been rudely stript of her royal dignity; and while ruthless hands have snatched the crown from off her head, she has finally been degraded to be the cringing handmaid of experimental science. And what was the unavoidable result? That very soon the principles of the old and sound philosophy fell into contempt, whilst in their stead, there arose a confusion and obscurity of ideas which oftentimes led scientists to defend most obvious errors that have thoroughly permeated certain branches of science. Thus our modern psychology as upheld by many of its advocates is a veri-

[†]) G. W. Peckham and E. G. Peckham. On the Instincts and Habits of the Solitary Wasps. Madison, 1898, p. 230.

table monstrosity. Even Wundt can not refrain from blaming modern psychology for its "premature application of notions insufficiently determined" and for its "ignorance of systematic psychological methods." And thus he explains how it happens "that the psychic processes of brutes are not taken for what they appear in immediate and unprejudiced observation, but that the observer's reflections are transferred to the animal. If, therefore, any vital action has the appearance of possibly being the result of a number of reasonings and conclusions, this is taken as a cogent proof that such reasonings and conclusions actually occurred. And thus all the psychic activity is resolved into logical reflections."*)

The above mentioned reasons, however, do not offer us the final and fundamental explanation for the persistent tendency of assigning a difference, between man and animal, not of kind but of degree.

As every other, so also the assumption of animal intelligence, is essentially rooted in the will. It does not require much depth or breath of intellect to see that the humanizing of the brute is a mere corollary of materialistic evolution. For materialism denies the existence of a vital principle apart from matter, and maintains that life is merely the resultant of attracting and repelling forces. Everything, therefore, is pure matter, and there can be no essential difference between the animal soul and that of man, since neither can exist independently of matter. But if there is no essential difference between the animating principles of man and brute, why assume any between the faculties and manifestations of these principles? In other words, if human actions are guided by intelligence, the same holds true for those of animals.

Hence it follows that the theory of animal intelligence is the natural outcome of materialism and as such must be traced back to the same source from which materialism ultimately springs. To speak plainly, the first promulgators of "animal intelligence" and those "popularizers," as Wheeler justly calls them, who now uphold it with such tendentious tenacity have often no other purpose in view than to establish a theoretical justification for descending practically to a level with the brute.

These reasons we believe clearly prove the deplorable character of this modern tendency which aims at leveling the difference between animal and man, a tendency which, because of its universality and the warm support it receives, calls for most strenuous opposition.

H. M.

*) Wundt, Vorlesungen ueber die Menschen- und Thierseele, 2. Aufl., p. 370.

MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE LESSONS FROM EXPERIENCE.

Within a comparatively recent period a number of life insurance societies conducted on the assessment plan, becoming alarmed by the rapidly increasing death-rate and necessarily heavier contributions by members, employed experts for an investigation of affairs and to suggest remedies.

In each and every case the result was the same. The experts in explaining the principles of life insurance, made it clear that the only safe way of conducting a life insurance business is by so adjusting the rates for the different ages as to provide for all current losses and the payment of the "last man," independently of the influx of new members.

In other words, the only remedy was the reserve or level premium plan as practised for years successfully by the so-called old-line insurance companies. Under that system the taxes on each member are so adjusted as to provide for the prompt payment of current losses, necessary expenses, and a sinking fund, which, together with interest accumulations, will equal the face of the promised insurance at the time when the last policy becomes a claim.

Some of the best and largest assessment companies organized as business enterprises have boldly recognized the errors of their original plans by reincorporating as regular life insurance companies under the laws for level premium and are now subject to the same supervision by the different State insurance departments, as their older competitors. (For example, the Mutual Reserve of N. Y., Security Mutual of N. Y., Fidelity Mutual of Pa., etc.) Other organizations, like the Ancient Order of United Workmen, for instance, were satisfied with increasing the rates in a more or less arbitrary fashion, without giving their members the benefits of clear-cut, positive contracts, providing for cash loans, cash values, and other options, as offered by regular insurance companies.

Unfortunately a good many Catholic societies established for furnishing life insurance, found themselves in the same boat with the others above mentioned. Some of them also had their affairs investigated by experts, learned practically the same lesson—and what was the result?

Comparatively few accepted the rates proposed as minimum; others increased the assessments for the members or reduced the promised benefits, but not sufficiently to insure permanency of existence. A still larger number are "discussing" or "considering" the matter, but doing nothing.

The importance of life insurance in the social system of the

present time needs no argument. It is universally recognized. But life insurance, to be of value, must be reliable. How can the average man, not an expert in such matters, but solicited frequently by insurance agents to "take a policy," or by friends or acquaintances to "join my lodge," decide off-hand whether the proposed protection is worth the price he is required to pay for it?

Where the question refers to regular insurance companies, the answer is simple, as any regular life insurance company licensed to do business by the insurance department of a State, must be considered solvent. The case is different with the numerous beneficial organizations, fraternals, lodges, and similar societies, which may under very elastic laws promise a good many things without being required to give security for the fulfilment of their contracts.

Here is where the value of the investigation by experts, previously referred to, comes in. It was demonstrated, and not disproven by anyone, that life insurance, if premiums are to remain the same every year for a given age during life, can not go under a certain mathematically fixed figure. Therefore any concern asking smaller payments for \$1,000 policy than these minimum rates can not maintain such rates for the life time of the assured and pay the promised benefits; in other words, is not safe.

Since the rate of interest must be taken into consideration, there might be room for dispute as to what rate to figure. But this question has been decided by a practically universal consent that 4% a year is safe enough as a basis, and although 3% is figured by a good many of the regular life insurance companies, yet 4% is accepted as the standard by most of the insurance departments.

So for the information of our readers here follows the annual level premium for \$1,000 of insurance, payable during life time, on the basis of the American table of mortality, with 4% interest, not including expenses:

Age	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
	\$12.67	12.94	13.24	13.55	13.87	14.21	14.57	14.95
Age	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
	\$15.35	15.77	16.21	16.68	17.18	17.70	18.25	18.84
Age	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43
	\$19.46	20.12	20.82	21.57	22.35	23.19	24.08	25.03
Age	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51
	\$26.04	27.12	28.27	29.50	30.81	32.31	33.70	35.29
Age	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
	\$36.98	38.79	40.73	42.79	45.00	47.35	49.87	52.57
								55.45

While it is not intended to say that every concern charging

the above or even higher rates is perfectly trustworthy, since a good many other considerations must determine that fact, it is perfectly safe to assume that any society pretending to furnish life insurance at less than the above figures (not including expenses) should be avoided by people in want of reliable protection for their families.

This table is also respectfully referred to such of the reverend clergy, and even dignitaries of the Church, as have shown themselves only too willing to commend professedly Catholic "insurance" organizations to the patronage of the faithful, without any knowledge of the fact whether the promised or expected benefits can be realized for any length of time at the prices paid for them.



THE STORY OF DR. EDWARD PREUSS' CONVERSION.

[As Told by Himself.]

V.

The trying and well-nigh interminable weeks of the voyage were over, and our emigrant found himself in Hoboken. A letter was here despatched to the presiding officer of the most orthodox of all Lutheran synods in America and, after a conference with an eminent author who had earlier emigrated from Germany, and to whom he had been recommended, there followed a time of quiet reflection.

The effect of his late experience upon the Lutheranism of his fatherland, which had but just begun to flourish, now rose more clearly to his view. If any series of events could have been devised for the purpose of injuring it very sensibly, it must have been precisely the one in which he had but shortly participated.

Was there not a special Providence? a God?

Most assuredly there was. Now then, this God had chosen him as the champion of the genuine Lutheran doctrine; had prepared him most carefully for this mission, and had almost forced him to publish a strong book on his central dogma. But hardly had this book seen the light, when the Almighty proceeded to cast it, together with its author and that central dogma, into one deep abyss.

Could the great God possibly be favorable to this "theologian" and his dogmatic system? It he was, then he surely had chosen the unwisest way imaginable to demonstrate His grace and favor.

Our poor immigrant, now in Hoboken, had been a faithful and ardent servant of the God of the Lutherans. Neither his conscience nor any man outside of Bedlam would have denied him this testimony. For he had served his master zealously at a time

when and in a place where the adherents of his half-forgotten majesty did not constitute even one-fiftieth part of the population.

In spite of all this, the Lutheran God had "permitted" his most zealous satellite to become the helpless prey of both their enemies.

True, the early Christians had also become the prey of their enemies; but it was precisely their defeat which had added glory to their own cause and that of God, and gained thousands of new adherents.

In this present case, on the contrary, the God of the Lutherans had calculated everything so nicely that not only his representative, but His own cause, aye the latter more than the former, had suffered serious injury. Only a madman could hope that the catastrophe which had befallen the author of 'The Justification of the Sinner Before God' would aid in making converts for this dogma; it was quite apparent that all the profit went to the opponents of orthodox Lutheranism.

Indeed, the God of Luther was clearly a most powerless being, more powerless even than the "absolute spirit" of the Rationalists, whose nullity had inspired the editor of Gerhard with so much gaiety.

These considerations made the ecclesiastical history of the last three hundred and fifty years appear to our immigrant in a new light. Had not the most eminent Lutheran theologian after Luther and Chemnitz, Matthew Flacius, also become the victim of a catastrophe, which turned him away from the orthodox system? And what about Elector John Frederick of Saxony, that model Lutheran, who was honored by his sect with the surname of "the Constant"? After having put all his confidence in the strong citadel of Luther, he was taken a prisoner at Mühlberg and saw his dominions pass into "traitor's hands." The University of Jena, which he established as a bulwark of Lutheran orthodoxy, is today a center of rationalistic æstheticism, and his descendants would ridicule any man who would ask them to believe in the "unchanged Augsburg confession."

"Deus thorax meus!" exclaimed Gustavus Adolphus on the morning of the battle of Lützen and was disgracefully slain. With him fell the glory of Lutheranism in central Europe. His only child became a Catholic, and the Alliance which bears his name to-day is as much opposed to genuine Lutheranism as it is to the Catholic Church.

The religious history of the rulers of Brandenburg likewise furnishes a fruitful subject for such meditations. Joachim II. raised the banner of pure Lutheranism in Berlin, after he had promised his father under oath that he would remain true to the Catholic faith. John Sigismund gave up the heritage of his ances-

tors and became faithless to a vow which he had made to his Lutheran progenitor, by embracing Calvinistic doctrines. Frederick II. finally substituted Rationalism and infidelity for the Reformed Church.

The history of certain cities that have become famous for their devotion to the Lutheran creed is no less instructive. "Verbum Dei manet in aeternum, the Word of God endures forever," was the motto which Magdeburg, so ardently devoted to the teachings of the Wittenberg Reformer, had inscribed on its escutcheon after the battle of Mühlberg, when it harbored within its walls hundreds of exiled Lutheran preachers, who had refused to accept the "Interim" of Charles V. and who denounced even Melancthon as a traitor to the faith. True, this ancient motto still decorates Magdeburg's coat-of-arms; but the courageous faith from which it sprang has vanished utterly. In 1551 the city had to surrender to the hated enemy, and in 1631 it perished in blood and smoke. Since then orthodox Lutheranism has practically died out there, and he who would suggest to its inhabitants that they return to the same, would be looked upon as an antediluvian dinosaur.

And what became of the Lutherans of Salzburg, who for the sake of Luther's creed left their Alpine homes in the first half of the eighteenth century? Nine-tenths of their descendants have not only lost their Lutheran creed, but every remnant of Christianity.

Not only Salzburg, nay all of Lutheran Prussia, and by far the larger half of Lutheran Germany, within a period of three hundred years lost everything that Luther had so ardently defended. By a curious evolution the faith of Wittenberg developed into Pietism, Pietism into Rationalism, and Rationalism into atheism. The unfortunate God of the Lutherans was compelled to witness how others who were mightier than he robbed him of his children by the million.

In very truth: what was left of Lutheranism between the Rhine and the Niemen, when our young Professor presented to the public the new edition of his beloved Chemnitz? It still counted a considerable number of adherents in the kingdom of Hanover and in the Duchies of Slesvig and Holstein, which were under Danish suzerainty. But right before his very eyes, by an astounding series of historical events, the latter were torn away from both the orthodox Lutheran faith and the King of Denmark. And scarcely one year after the publication of his pamphlet against the Immaculate Conception, Hanover shared the same fate.

And as for the attempts to reënforce "the word of God and the teaching of Luther," which "were nevermore to perish," in those

countries that had once been Lutheran, they had all of them turned out sorry failures.

A "super-terrestrial majesty" that acted in this wise, surely lacked not only one, but several of the divine attributes, notably omnipotence and wisdom.

The history of Lutheranism now appeared to our immigrant either as a tissue of most irrational occurrences, without a trace of divine leadership or providence; or simply as a kind of transition to draw people from the Catholic Church, and then to make way for some other stage of evolution.

[*To be continued.*]

SP SP SP

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

The New Century Catholic Readers. Benziger Brothers, New York and Cincinnati.

In this series of readers for our Catholic schools the bookmaker's art is seen at its best. A progressive plan is carried out in the choice of the selections, many of which are new and not a few of them from our best Catholic authors. The biographical notes in the Fourth Reader are timely and interesting. Not only are the illustrations excellent from an artistic point of view, but what is still more worthy of praise, is the Catholic tone that distinguishes most of the splendid reproductions in color. This is in refreshing contrast to so many illustrations in books of non-Catholic publishers. The series is worthy of our parochial schools and may be heartily recommended to our teachers. With such excellent Catholic school-books on the market, we can see absolutely no reason why our parochial schools should patronize Protestant concerns.

Pluck; the Story of a Little "Greenhorn" in America; by George Grimm. Germania Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis. Price \$1.

The title sufficiently indicates the drift of the book. It tells the old story of thrift, honesty, and perseverance paving the way to success. Herr Bertram, his wife, and five children are a happy family in the Bavarian highlands. Poverty enters the home and the children must go out into the world to seek their own fortune. Philip, the fourth, leaves for America. He is the little "Greenhorn" whose adventures in the new world form the burden of the tale. Pictures of the Civil War add a pleasing variety to the story, and at the end, Philip, now Colonel Bertram, wins the hand of Bessie Lawrence, a "blue-blood" Yankee girl. The book is appropriately dedicated to the German-Americans of this country.

MINOR TOPICS.

Archbishop Elder's Strict Rules With Regard to Catholic Schools.—We gladly comply with the request of several of our readers to reproduce the salient portions of a pastoral letter recently addressed by the venerable Archbishop of Cincinnati to the clergy and laity of his Diocese. The letter is dated August 18th, 1904, and appeared in full in the *Catholic Telegraph* of August 25th, from which we quote :

"1. In places where there is a Catholic school parents are obliged under the pain of mortals in to send their children to it. This rule holds good, no only in case of children who have not yet made their first Communion, but also in case of those who have received it. Parents should send their children to the Catholic school as long as its standards and grades are as good as those of the non-Catholic school. And even if there is no school attached to the congregation of which parents are members, they would still be obliged to send their children to a parochial school, college, or academy, if they can do so without great hardships either to themselves or to their children.

2. It is the province of the Bishop to decide whether a parish should be exempted from having a parish school, and whether, in case there be a Catholic in the place, parents may send their children to a non-Catholic school. Each case must be submitted to us, except when there is question of children living three or more miles distant from a Catholic school. Such children can hardly be compelled to attend the Catholic school.

3. As the obligation of sending a child to a Catholic school binds under the pain of mortal sin, it follows that the neglect to comply with it, is a matter of accusation, when going to confession. We fail to see how fathers and mothers who omit to accuse themselves of this fault can believe that they are making an entire confession of their sins.

4. Confessors are hereby forbidden to give absolution to parents, who without permission of the Archbishop send their children to non-Catholic schools, unless such parents promise either to send them to the Catholic school, at the time to be fixed by the confessor, or, at least agree, within two weeks from the day of confession, to refer the case to the Archbishop, and abide by his decision. If they refuse to do either one or the other, the confessor can not give them absolution ; and should he attempt to do so, such absolution would be null and void. Cases of this kind are hereby numbered among the reserved cases from September, 1st, 1904.

5. The loss of Catholic training which the children suffer by being sent to non-Catholic schools must as far as possible be counteracted. Wherefore, we strictly enjoin that Diocesan Statute No. 64 be adhered to: 'We decree that those who are to be admitted to first holy Communion shall have spent at least two years in Catholic schools. This rule is to be observed also by superiors of colleges and academies.' This Statute was enacted in Our Synod in 1898, and we regret that it has not always been ob-

served. The necessity of complying with it is evident. It is difficult to properly prepare for first Communion even the children who have always attended Catholic schools; and it is simply impossible to do so when the children are allowed to go to non-Catholic schools up to a few months before they are to make their first holy Communion. Pastors, superiors of academies and colleges are admonished to observe this regulation. No exception is to be made to it without our permission. In places where there is no Catholic school, pastors will confer with us as to the provision, which should be made for the instruction for first Communion.

6. Pastors seeking to prevent parents from taking their children too soon out of school have made regulations regarding the age of first Communion. As there has been some discrepancy in regard to this matter, some fixing one age, some a different one, and in consequence causing dissatisfaction among parents and children, We hereby direct that no child shall be admitted to first Communion, made publicly and solemnly, unless it has completed its thirteenth year on or before the day fixed for first Communion.

7. It is the pastor's duty to decide whether the children of his parish have sufficient knowledge for making their first Communion. Hence, children attending a Catholic school other than the parish school, as well as those going to colleges and academies, must not be admitted to first Communion unless their pastor has testified that they are sufficiently instructed for approaching the Holy Table.

8. In connection with the matter under consideration, we desire to draw the attention of the faithful to the following provision of the III. Plenary Council of Baltimore: 'Let pastors, moreover, take great pains that the boys and girls be better instructed in Catholic doctrine and in their Christian duties for two years following their first Communion.' This regulation supposes on the part of the parents the obligation of using their parental authority to compel their children to attend these catechetical instructions. The pastor, to insure the attendance of the children, should fix such a time for the instructions as will best suit their convenience. Usually, the most suitable time is on Sundays before Vespers or before Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament. We exhort parents and adults to be also present at these instructions. We may have known the truths of our religion very well when we made our first Communion, but unless we recall them to mind from time to time, we will forget them. It is especially desirable that parents should attend in order to see whether their children are present and whether they have diligently studied the Catechism."

A Dangerous Writer Unmasked.—Since 1895 THE REVIEW has, we might almost say unceasingly, denounced a certain Abbé Boeglin, who for a number of years has done his best to poison public opinion in this country and Europe by alleged "Roman letters," written in Paris, to various Catholic and secular newspapers. In the United States these letters were printed under the pen-name "Innominato" in the New York *Sun* and reproduced (more or less regularly in many other newspapers, among them Catholic journals of standing and influence like, e. g., the *Catholic Union* and *Times*. His aliases in France and Belgium were Fidelis, Tiber,

Courtely, Lucens, Richeville, Penna Vera, etc. For a while he contributed directly to the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen* and a few other American Catholic papers under the signature Bentivoglio. On March 29th, 1900, we said of him in this REVIEW :

"Abbé Boeglin, residing as he does in Paris, knows no more about what is thought and done in the Vatican than any ordinary newspaper reader." He "has for many years done yoeman's service in the cause of Liberalism by inventing or perverting facts and sophisticating public opinion in Europe and America . . . to the full extent of his journalistic influence." And on May 10th of the same year : " 'Rome correspondence' is M. Boeglin's forte. He draws it from his inner consciousness with the occasional aid of items from the *Osservatore Romano*, the *Voce della Verità*, and the venomously anti-Catholic *Italie* and *Tribuna*. The wonder of it is that such pernicious activity can continue so long and so impudently, to the detriment of thousands of unsophisticated Catholic and non-Catholic newspaper readers" . . . Boeglin is "an unblushing fabricator of bogus news and a vendor of stilted phrases."

Since 1895 there is hardly one volume of the THE REVIEW that does not contain similar denunciations, most, if not all of them, based on contemporary facts which we did not hesitate to publish. Nevertheless the *Sun* continued to print and several Catholic weeklies continued to reproduce Boeglin's bogus Rome letters. It was not until a few weeks ago that we noticed that one of this dangerous prevaricator's staunchest admirers, the *Buffalo Catholic Union and Times*, began to grow doubtful as to "Innominato's" standing and orthodoxy. (See our note in No. 34, p. 543). Taking up the N. Y. *Sun* of Sept. 11th and looking into Boeglin's latest exhortation—a thing which, for sheer disgust, we had not done for a long time—we immediately perceived the reason for the Buffalo paper's withdrawal of good will. The unfortunate Boeglin is beginning to show his true colors ! In this latest "Rome letter" of his he speaks of Pope Leo XIII., for whom, in his life-time, he could never find words enough of fulsome flattery, in these scandalous terms :

"From the religious point of view is it worth while to attach so much importance to prestige and to devote so much care to preserving it? Is not prestige by itself, without real power and active force, the creator of fatal illusions and unfortunate misunderstandings? It is impossible not to have such thoughts in reading the 'Acts' of Leo XIII. and particularly in reading the letters which he addressed almost every year to his Secretary of State. More even than the tenor of these instructions, the tone in which they are written and the feeling that inspires them make us ask ourselves whether they come from the Pope of the Roman Church or from the Emperor of the world. In them every great nation appears with the dimensions and the importance of a province ; a few grandiloquent but pretty vague lines indicate the conduct to be held regarding each one of them. The United States of America is mentioned after all the other Powers as being the last comer among them. Finally the Sovereign Pontiff considers with haughty bitterness the particular condition of Italy, a Power that is not recognized and can find no place in a document emanating officially from the Holy See, save for an ill repressed tendency and an in-

dulgence for which it blames itself. These letters show, and will show for a long time yet, a majestic and incontestable greatness. But already, through the solemnity of formulas and even the elevation of the views, we seem to recognize the grandiloquence and pompous rhetoric which mark the acts and constitutions of the last Emperors of the East. You are never tempted to smile, but you begin to doubt and to seek, under the majestic cover of the words, the meaner reality of the facts."

Thus doth the faker stand unmasked ; and if it be too much to expect that the Catholic editorial fraternity of this country will in future use greater caution and listen more willingly to the warning voice of well-meaning and better-informed colleagues, let us at least hope that this "unblushing fabricator of bogus news and vendor of stilted phrases," who has done so much to mislead public opinion and spread the doctrines of false Liberalism, will never regain his prestige in the Catholic press.

University Conundrums.—A Toledo subscriber writes to *THE REVIEW*: Professor Maurice F. Egan's statement about the "Catholic University of America," quoted in No. 34 of *THE REVIEW*, suggests the following :

1. MATHEMATICAL PROBLEM.

Minuend: x = Unknown (small?) total number of University students.

Subtrahend: y = Unknown "large number of non-Catholic" students (Egan).

Remainder: z = Unknown number of Catholic students.

For any ordinary mathematician there are evidently too many unknown quantities in this problem to discover the real value of z . But might it not be possible to induce Professor Egan, apparently so well posted in the statistics of the University, to give us the necessary hints for the solution of the above problem?

2. PRACTICAL QUESTIONS.

1. Have the big funds been collected for the benefit of the few "Catholic" students, of the "large number of non-Catholics," or for the development of the many professors?

2. If, as we must suppose, the money is for the benefit of the few "Catholic" students, what does it cost to support each one of them?

Are Catholic Organists, Singers, Etc., Allowed to Play and Sing in Protestant Choirs?—This question is answered by a learned Jesuit Father as follows :

If these professions are exercised spontaneously or for mere gain, they clearly contain an approbation and promotion of non-Catholic worship, and, therefore, *formal* co-operation with a false religion. Even if they would be forced or compelled to do it, they could not escape the guilt of formal co-operation. For the singing of hymns, etc., which form part of a non-Catholic religious rite, can not be separated from the rite itself. The case would be different, however, if non-Catholic songs would be rendered in civil or profane festivities, provided the song does not contain formal heresies. An exception to this last point seems to be the introduction of Puritan or Huguenot songs in a merely historical way, as is done in some of the great operas.

May Catholic Architects and Workingmen Build Protestant Churches?—

In the "Question Box" conducted for the *Catholic Union and Times* by the Jesuit Fathers of Canisius College, Buffalo, this question is answered as follows (xxxiii, 21):

1. Catholic workingmen, who are employed by an architect to undertake any building that may be contracted for, are allowed for any reasonable cause to work on such building. Such a reason would be if they could not easily find another job equally remunerative.

2. For Catholic architects a graver reason than the mere cessation of a temporary gain is required. They would, however, be excused from formal co-operation if they had reason to fear that by refusing the church contract they would lose the trade of other parties.

—Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee, in an address delivered in the Exposition Music Hall on Sunday, Sept. 11th, told the German Catholics of St. Louis, why a good Catholic can not be a Socialist. He said it was unfortunately true that many Catholic laboringmen in this country, while faithfully practising their religion, went to the polls on election day and voted the Socialistic ticket. This could be due only to ignorance of the pernicious principles underlying the Socialistic propaganda, which appeared innocent and reasonable enough on the face of it, but must inevitably lead to a condition of affairs not only incompatible with the principles of revealed religion but of common sense as well. The Archbishop said that, in consequence of this condition of affairs, the sacred duty devolved upon all intelligent Catholics to make themselves thoroughly familiar with the real aims and tendencies of Socialism and the Catholic principles opposing them. In a brief explanation of the essence of Socialism he showed that what is good and commendable in its aspirations and demands, has been long advocated and in part executed by the Catholic Church, while those features and principles that are new and specifically Socialistic, are false and would, if carried out in practice, lead to the destruction of all the ties that bind human society together.

—Our esteemed contemporary the Milwaukee *Excelsior* (Sept. 8th), commenting on our recent brief historical résumé of the Catholic Indian school question, while conceding the correctness of the facts as stated (THE REVIEW, No. 33), thinks they are apt to create a wrong impression because incompletely set forth. It calls attention to the circumstance that the fight against the Catholic Indian schools began under the administration of President Harrison, when Morgan and Dorchester were in charge of the Indian Bureau. How bitterly these two bigoted fanatics strove to injure the Catholic mission schools, can be seen from the annual report of the Catholic Indian Bureau for 1891-1892. THE REVIEW, as its readers are well aware, is absolutely non-partisan in politics, and when it treats political questions at all, endeavors to state the facts both accurately and completely, and to judge them in the pure white light of Catholic truth and justice. We therefore cheerfully and thankfully take notice of the *Excelsior's* correction

and beg our readers to add the above consideration to those mentioned in our No. 33, before definitely making up their mind on the question of the relative responsibility of the two great political parties for the policy which has nearly ruined our Catholic Indian schools.

—The Abbé Veillet, of the "Oeuvre de Saint-Joseph" at Poitiers, in the excellent monthly of the Catholic Workingmen's Associations of France, *L'Union* (No. 237), describes a "Gospel League" which has recently been established in that city. "Every week fifty or sixty laboring-men, under the leadership of their curé, meet to study the holy Gospel. One after another they take their turn in explaining certain verses which are assigned to each eight days in advance. Every Monday an ex-member of one of the religious orders suppressed by the iniquitous Combes régime, delivers to the members a lecture, illustrated with stereopticon views, on some chapter from the New Testament." If the key for the solution of the vexed social question is contained in the Gospel, as it most certainly is, this mode of teaching the workingmen its value and use must be called timely and admirable.

—The population of the German Empire, according to the latest *Statistisches Jahrbuch*, is now 59,495,000, one and one-fourth as large as that of France. Arthur Loth, commenting "cette terrible statistique" in No. 4034 of *La Vérité Française*, says that the headway of Germany over France is due largely to the conduct of the anti-Catholic government of the republic, which is systematically destroying those influences which make for good morals and social progress, while at the same time it encourages and furthers drunkenness and licentiousness. "The race is growing weak and degraded . . . As a nation we have lost first rank and are now on a par with Italy."

—Bishop McFaul of Trenton, in his address to the forty-ninth annual convention of the German Catholic Centralverein in St. Louis, on Sept. 11th, said that in his opinion there ought to be in this country to-day at least forty million Catholics, whereas really there are only from twelve to fifteen million. He said he would not on this occasion enquire into the causes of the leakage, but that there had been a tremendous leakage, was absolutely undeniable. When he added that the leaks were now stopped and that we were not only holding our own but making heavy inroads into Protestantism, he betrayed an optimism which was not shared by many of his hearers.

—Dr. Ely Vandewarker, a physician of Syracuse, N. Y., is causing considerable discussion by denouncing coeducational institutions as breeding grounds for immorality. He published a book on the subject last spring and now emphasizes his statements in the most vigorous manner possible. Dr. Vandewarker claims that he bases his objections on cases that have come under his own eyes as a practising physician, and says he is ready to prove his position.

